

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 16, 1999 LB 179, 745

either side of the equation. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. For discussion on part one of the divided committee amendment, Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. I...Senator Coordsen was correct, you can divide this up into a number of different segments and you can cost out each one if that's the discussion that we want to have this morning. Senator Beutler indicates the he's afraid that 179 wouldn't fit in the budget. The bill or the committee amendments that are being suggested to you this morning are just a little more costly than the bill that Senator Raikes introduced at the request of the Governor, and I think there were provisions in the Governor's budget recommendations to fund it. If things have changed, I'm not sure about that, but the expanded liability that would be incurred by reason of the committee amendments is solely due to the changes in the definition of the disabled person that would be able to qualify and that may or may not be a significant price tag. I don't know how the budget is developing and whether...what all's going to fit at this point, but I am assuming that there was room for 179 as it was submitted to the committee...or (LB) 745 as it was submitted to the committee, and that's basically what you have with some, as I've indicated, some increase for the expanded definition of disability. But let me speak to the issue of what income levels people should have in order to still be able to qualify for the homestead exemption. We changed the income counting, if you will, and the income levels significantly in 1994. Those were brought together in a bill and, as I indicated earlier in remarks, at that time we changed the income that was counted, and we started including income that wasn't taxable income. So, at the same time we did that, we increased the income amounts because we knew that we had to make some adjustments if we were going to count extra income into the schedule. Now, at that time, we also indexed those amounts, but we didn't know through any kind of a definitive study whether those income levels were the right levels, given the changes in definition of income that we had adopted. This year we had one, two, three, four, five, six, six different bills come before the Revenue Committee suggesting to us that in a variety of respects that the income levels that